

REMARKS

Claim 18 was rejected as being indefinite because “said slidable member” lacks positive antecedent basis.

Claim 18 was amended to change “said slidable member” to “a slidable member”.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Shiotani et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete the term “mechanical connection that pulls and pushes” in favor of language showing that the portions on each end of the guide means are integral with the guide means resulting in only one part.

One difference between Shiotani et al and the applicant’s invention is in the mechanism for making the connection of the guide to the to the main body or base.

With reference to Fig. 35 in the Shiotani et al. patent, it is shown that Shiotani et al. uses a large number of parts including a handle 404 which moves an operation member 407 which pushes up against connection rod 411, which pushes against an adjusting screw 415, attached to a plate 414, pivotable about a pivot axis 413, to engage projection 416, against guide projection 216. The connecting rod 411 is in compression when the guide is locked in position. There is no direct connection from the connecting rod 411 to the guide projections 216 since there are so many independent parts therebetween. A flange 420, on connecting rod 411, has a spring 412 for pushing the connecting rod 411 back and releasing the engage projection 416 from the guide projection 216.

The applicant has a much simpler apparatus for locking the guide to the base. Claim 1, as amended, now recites a guide means having a portion directly attached on each end for engaging the apparatus. There is only one part used to engage the guide to the apparatus as opposed to multiple parts, which engage each other in Shiotani et al. Therefore claim 1, as amended, is clearly not anticipated Shiotani et al. since the number of parts and the method of operation is different.

It is believed that the amended claims showing that there is only one part with

three integral sections, in claim 1, for locking the guide to the apparatus as opposed to the multiple parts in Shiotani et al. makes claim 1 allowable over the anticipation rejection.

Since claim 1 is allowable all of the dependent claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 19, which was an independent claim, has been cancelled. Claims 1-18 are believed to be allowable.